

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed May 18, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-18, 44-52, 54-56, 58-60, 62-63, and 65-68 are pending. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks provided herein below and withdrawal of the present rejections are respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 was objected to because "the printer" at the end of the claim lacked antecedent basis.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claim to correct the antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment does not narrow the scope of the claim.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 11-13, 44 and 57 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Harriot.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 50, 54, 55, 58 and 59 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeClair in view of Shimada.

On page 9 of the Office Action, claim 56 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeClair in view of Shimada and in further view of Matsuyama..

On page 10 of the Office Action, claims 60, 62, 63, 65 and 66 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeClair in view of Shimada and in further view of Matsuyama.

On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 51 and 52 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeClair in view of Shimada and in further view of Maeda et al.

On page 12 of the Office Action, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Harriot and in further view of Hoover.

On page 12 of the Office Action, claim 14 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Harriot and in further view of Shimada.

On page 13 of the Office Action, claims 15-18 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Harriot and in further view of Official Notice.

On page 14 of the Office Action, claims 45-49 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Harriot and in further view of Matsuyama.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations recited in the independent claims.

For example, claim 1 recites that a globally-unique identifier assigned to a presentation object is identified in a print data stream. The presentation object having the assigned globally-unique identifier is captured at the printing system. Independent claim 13, 44, 50 and 67 include similar limitations.

In contrast Smith discloses that a data stream that includes common page print data and unique print data includes a naming field for uniquely naming the common page print data in the print stream. However, Smith teaches that the common page print data is part of the print stream. Thus, Smith does not capture the common page print data using the unique name provided in the naming field. Rather, the naming field merely allows one set of common page print data to be distinguished from a second set of common page print data.

The Applicants invention requires capturing a presentation object that is identified by a globally-unique identifier in a print stream. The presentation object is not provided in the print stream. Capturing involves the acquiring and storing of a presentation object. Once a presentation object is captured, it becomes a resident resource in the printer and lasts across

server sessions and printer power-off cycles. The use of a globally unique identifier allows the downloaded objects to be captured for reuse without additional download time overhead.

Thus, the object may be captured by the device the first time it is "referenced" in a data stream and thereafter any reference to the object after it is captured uses the downloaded version and therefore avoids re-transmission. Moreover, it may be referenced by several print streams or presentation systems.

Thus, Smith fails to suggest capturing a presentation object using a globally unique identifier received in a print steam.

Harriot fails to overcome the deficiencies of Smith. Harriot merely describes a method for obtaining a copy of an object, wherein a second object refers to the data object by use of a location-dependent identifier and a globally-unique location-independent identifier that identifies the data object. However, Harriot fails to disclose, teach or suggest capturing a presentation object using a globally unique identifier received in a print steam.

Thus, claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67 are patentable over Smith and Harriot.

LeClair fails to overcome the deficiencies of Smith and Harriot. LeClair discloses a print server that retrieves print jobs from a queue. According to the retrieved print job, the print server may retrieve an object for printing.

However, LeClair fails to disclose, teach or suggest capturing a presentation object that is identified by a globally-unique identifier in a print stream. LeClair does not receive a print stream, but rather retrieves a print job from a queue in an initiator. Moreover, capturing involves the acquiring and storing of a presentation object. Once a presentation object is captured, it becomes a resident resource in the printer and lasts across server sessions and printer power-off cycles. The use of a globally unique identifier allows the downloaded

objects to be captured for reuse without additional download time overhead. LeClair merely discloses retrieving an object to be printed, but fails to mention capturing the object so the object thereby becomes a resident resource in the printer. LeClair must retrieve the object the next time the object is part of a print job that is retrieved from a print queue by the print server.

Thus, LeClair, Smith and Harriot, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67.

Shimada fails to overcome the deficiencies of LeClair, Smith and Harriot. Shimada merely discloses RAM for providing a work area for a CPU of a digital copying machine control unit. However, Shimada does not suggest capturing presentation object for printing. LeClair failed to suggest capturing presentation object for printing. Accordingly, Shimada fails to suggest capturing a presentation object using a globally unique identifier received in a print steam.

Thus, Shimada, LeClair, Smith and Harriot, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67.

Matsuyama fails to overcome the deficiencies of LeClair, Smith, Harriot and Shimada. Matsuyama does not disclose the capture of a presentation object at a printer based upon a globally-unique identifier referenced in a print stream. Rather, Matsuyama discloses an image control apparatus for sending a print order to an output control apparatus to execute a print service via the Internet. The image control apparatus receives a client order including editing information generated by editing image data from a client via the Internet and determines an output destination of output control apparatuses in accordance with the received client order. A print order is generated by accessing an image server with high-

resolution image data based on an image ID designated by the client order. The print order is sent to the output destination of the output control apparatuses, wherein the print order is not directly printed and final print data to be directly printed is generated based on the print order generated by said order control means..

Accordingly, Matsuyama merely describes a process for registering an image file at an image server. Matsuyama does not disclose the capture of a presentation object at a printer based upon a globally-unique identifier referenced in a print steam.

Accordingly, Matsuyama, Shimada, LeClair, Smith and Harriot, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67.

Maeda et al. fail to overcome the deficiencies of LeClair, Smith, Harriot, Shimada and Matsuyama. Maeda et al. is merely discloses a print utility that allows a user to provide a web page's URL to a printer, wherein the printer retrieves the web page and prints the URL. However, Maeda et al. fail to suggest identifying in a print data stream a presentation object according to a globally-unique identifier. Maeda et al. also fail to suggest capturing a presentation object having a globally-unique identifier provided in a print data stream.

Accordingly, Maeda et al., Matsuyama, Shimada, LeClair, Smith and Harriot, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67.

Hoover fails to remedy the deficiencies of LeClair, Smith, Harriot, Shimada, Matsuyama and Maeda et al. Hoover merely teaches the use of a time stamp. Hoover fails to disclose, teach or suggest identifying in a print data stream a presentation object for printing within a page by the printing system according to a globally-unique identifier assigned to the

presentation object and capturing the presentation object having the assigned globally-unique identifier at the printer.

Accordingly, LeClair, Smith, Harriot, Shimada, Matsuyama Maeda et al. and Hoover, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67.

The modification of Smith and Harriot with the Officially Noticed facts fails to teach or suggest deleting objects that are captured using a globally-unique identifier provided in a print stream. Applicants hereby traverse the Official Notice and, in accordance with MPEP § 2144.03, request the Examiner to cite a reference in support of the Official Notice that it is well known to deleting objects that are captured using a globally-unique identifier provided in a print stream. In particular, the Examiner is requested to provide evidence that discloses all of the elements recited in claims 15-18, and also that provides motivation for modifying any reference or for combining references.

The Examiner is referred to MPEP § 2144.03 regarding Office Notice. Allegations concerning specific knowledge of the prior art...should be supported and the applicant should be given the opportunity to challenge the correctness of such assertions and allegations. The facts so noticed serve to “fill the gaps” which might exist in the evidentiary showing and should not comprise the principle evidence upon which a rejection is based. MPEP § 2144.03, citing *In re Ahlert* 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420-421 (CCPA 1970).

Nevertheless, LeClair, Smith, Harriot, Shimada, Matsuyama Maeda et al., Hoover and the Office Notice, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67.

Dependent claims 2-12, 14-18, 45-49, 51-52, 54-56, 58-60, 62-63, 65-66 and 68 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1, 13, 44, 50 and 67. Further dependent claims 2-12, 14-18, 45-49, 51-52, 54-56, 58-60, 62-63, 65-66 and 68 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-12, 14-18, 45-49, 51-52, 54-56, 58-60, 62-63, 65-66 and 68 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: 

Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204